THE PATRIOT

No. 19.—Vol. II. 15 JUNE, 1922. PRICE SIXPENCE.

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.

KANT AND THE HOHENZOLLERNS—See page 7.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Satan Finds Some Mischief Still	1
A Brighton Soviet	2
Notes of the Week	3
Revolutionary Portraits—No. V.	5
The Truth About Ireland	6
Unreported Conversations—No. VI.	7
The Rutenburg Concession	8
The 4th Duke of Bedford's Prophecy	8
Letters of a Patriot—No. XIII.	9
Trade Union Notes	9
"Listening In"	10
The Conchy in the Civil Service	10
Is the Church of England Going Red	11
The Outlook in Ireland	12
Trade Union Slavery	13
Correspondence—	
A Third Letter from America	14
Patriotism	15

All communications for the Editor or Manager to be addressed to—The Boswell Printing and Publishing Co. Ltd., 2, Whitefriars Street, E.C.4.

LIBRARY NOV ... UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

SATAN FINDS SOME MISCHIEF STILL.

As thunderstorms arise from two currents of electricity, so there are positive and negative, active and passive causes which from their union create revolutions. The positive is the conspiracies and propaganda of our enemies who work in secret for our destruction. This work we believe to be far more dangerous than the public suspect. It needs a telescope to see the flames of Bolshevism rising into the skies upon the other side of the Irish Channel. People here go about their business oblivious of that terrible conflagration which rages over that quarter of the United Kingdom. Yet sparks from such a fire have been known to leap a wider than the Irish Sea, and for our safety we ought to remember that in Karl Marx's plan of campaign that arch revolutionary laid it down that the social revolution which was to destroy England must begin in Ireland—an ideal base and shelter for such operations. How the plot of that "cold, unsmiling Jew" comes to fulfilment may be gathered from the speech made by General Prescott-Decie at the Caxton Hall on Friday. The General, with both military and police experience to guide him, and apparently definite information, also uttered this very grave warning:—

> If you let Ulster go, you will go next. . . . At the same moment you will be attacked over here. This country of yours is divided up into areas of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, and each area has its commandant; and the Sinn Feiners and the Bolsheviks have undoubtedly got arms. You are the Loyalists, and you are not allowed to carry arms. If anything occurs and the Sinn Feiners, backed up by Bolsheviks, turn out with arms what are you going to do? You have not a dog's chance.

Now people may reply that the Communists and the Irish Revolutionaries together in this country are but a trifling part of the population, and that is true. Mr. Churchill recently taunted Ireland with the fact (as he alleged) that the whole country was held in terror by 2 per cent. of the population. Modern French historians hold that the Terror in France was organised and maintained by about the same proportion. In Russia the Bolsheviks are said to number only 100,000. The truth is that an organised and armed minority working on a plan can terrorise a majority which is unarmed and unorganised. As General Prescott-Decie said, the Government is the natural organisation and defence of the majority. If that defence surrenders to violence and intimidation, nothing exists to fight the Terror. Brave and resolute men may attempt to improvise a defence; but, without plans and without knowledge, they are likely to fail. The Revolutionaries, working secretly and resolutely, strike down these opponents, and at the same time strike terror into the timid mass of the population. That is how revolutions come about, when Governments surrender or betray their trust. Are we so certain that our Government will not surrender or betray the loyal population? They have done it in Ireland, and in principle they have done it at Genoa.

From our knowledge of the working of the conspiracy in this country, we may say it is more formidable—far more formidable—than the unwary imagine. The Irish rebels and the Communists are working together. They have many Allies, and far more dupes. Their propaganda and their organisation take many and unsuspected shapes. The Labour Party is riddled with Marxism, which is the theory of Revolution. And such secret organisations as "co-Masonry," and the Order of the Illuminati, which have been recently organised in England, discipline an increasing number of dupes in blind obedience to an unknown authority, so that when the moment comes a chorus is provided to shout as in the French Revolution, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," as in the Russian Revolution, "No Annexations, no Indemnities," or whatever catchword may be chosen to attract and inflame the crowd.

Now, as to the crowd itself, we must remember that there is such a thing as mass-psychology,

which is the subject of careful study by the organisers of Revolution. A crowd laughs, weeps, and is excited to pity or anger more easily than the individuals which compose it. An appearance of unanimity and emotion attracts and moves the masses, for it touches the ancient tribal instinct which dictates fashions in thought and action as well as in dress. Once the great crowd is set in motion it sweeps like an avalanche all before it: when it again comes to rest, it is to find the new tyranny which has used its agitation to destroy its natural guides and protectors—the upper classes—firmly consolidated. There remains only to destroy the dupes, and the operation is complete: the Terror is unquestioned.

But it may be said that the mass of the British nation is too solid, too loyal, or too imperturbable to be stirred into any such catastrophe. In normal times there is force in this objection. But—and here we come to the negative element in our human thunderstorm—the times are not normal. There at present exists a vast idle population of unemployed workmen—unemployed for so long a time that they are losing hope and becoming desperate—an ideal ground for the active revolutionary element to work in. And we need have no doubt upon this point, for the Communist journals openly boast of their success with certain sections of the unemployed, whom they are at this moment organising for the destruction of the rest of the nation.

Let us remind our readers of Bacon's sage observation: "If there be fuel prepared, it is hard to tell whence the spark shall come that shall set it on fire." And the fuel prepared is between one and two millions of unemployed working men. It is a danger that must continue until our industries are set at work again, and here, again, our Government, from mere folly or under sinister influences, is neglecting its duty and betraying its trust.

Our industries are idle, partly because of the destruction of markets over which we have no control, but partly because our Government continues to neglect the main business of the nation—its industries, in which we include agriculture as not the least. In everything, it is evident, Mr. Lloyd George takes and follows the interest of international finance rather than national production. These interests are two: they are opposite. International finance has little interest in British industry, which was built up on native capital; but has a very deep interest in German industry, which rests upon Jewish capital. It would suit international finance to see British industry in the dust, because then German industry would have but one rival left—the American industrial system. How far there is a true rivalry and how far secret understanding between the German and American industrial systems does not concern us at present.

The result of the Coalition policy is that British industry is being rapidly strangled. The weight of taxation pulls at one end of the cord, free foreign importations at another. The Government pretends to a sympathy with the British manufacturer, but in practice and in secret works against him. Let us give an example. The Government made certain pledges to our manufacturers during the war, and pretended to fulfil them by the Safeguarding of Industries Act, under which powers are given to protect almost any British industry that requires it. However, nothing effective has been done in this way, and industry—factory upon factory—is quenching its fires and putting up its shutters.

What a melancholy and terrible thing is the decay of a British industry! It means the loss of livelihood to so many decent and worthy people, the cream and the pith of the nation; it means the loss of aptitudes, inherited skill, trade secrets of a quite incalculable value; it means also the loss of strength to the nation, for let us always remember that industries are to a country what his locks were to Samson—the true secret of his strength. Destroy the industries of a nation, and the nation itself cannot long survive.

But our immediate point is this—that the policy of the Coalition, which is founded not on British production but on international finance, is responsible for much of the idleness which now exists in this country: it is preparing the material which makes the task of the revolutionary easy. The Government, by its neglect of industry, is its own Guy Fawkes, storing gunpowder in its own cellars, so that nothing is left to the Bolshevist but to apply the match.

A BRIGHTON SOVIET.

When the Labour Party and the Bolshevists united in August, 1920, to form a Council of Action several local Councils of Action were formed. One of these was at Brighton. An elaborate scheme was prepared for the seizure of food supplies and the control of the town in case of a general strike to assist Soviet Russia's war on Poland. Since then nothing more has been heard of the Brighton Soviet. But it appears from a circular which the Brighton, Hove, and District Trades Council has issued that a fresh attempt is now being made to create a nucleus of a Soviet for the control of affairs at Brighton. We are indebted to the *Communist* of last week for particulars. It is proposed to form Industrial Councils representing given industries. Each trade union branch "whose members are employed in given industries shall be represented on this Industrial Council by two delegates."

From these Industrial Councils a Council of Industries shall be called into being, consisting of four representatives from each, elected annually. This Council of Industries shall take the place and function as now does the Trades Council. Its duty shall be to create common thought and action on all matters affecting the workers, and a strike or lock-out in any industry shall immediately become its business. In conjunction with the Labour Group on the Town Council it shall deal with all matters affecting the workers on public bodies, nominate representatives for same, and deal with all questions affecting the workers as citizens. It shall deal with all questions of a national character. It shall at all times work for reconstruction of organisation nationally, and endeavour to bring about organisation by industry.

The *Communist* is pleased with this Brighton scheme, and hopes other Trades Councils will consider it. The plan is not quite as complete as the 1920 scheme, and some of the defects from the Bolshevist point of view are mentioned by the *Communist*. It points out that there is "no mention of the relations of the new body with the co-operative organisations and the part that the co-operatives can be made to play in the class struggle." The *Communist* adds:—

Nor is the desire set definitely forth to make of the Council of Industries a Workers' Council exercising jurisdiction over the entire working class movement in the locality—industrial, political, co-operative. And that surging, challenging temper, so needful to-day, to call and inspire the workers for the struggle, to breed in them that faith and loyalty to the Council which will enable them to face the combats ahead with unbroken solidarity is something lacking. *But all these things will come.* (Italics our own.)

There is no doubt about the real aims of this Brighton proposal: it is a revival in a modified form of the idea of the Council of Action. The previous plan was too extreme, and frightened many members of the trade unions. This time the organisers of the Soviet intend to proceed more cautiously. It will be interesting to observe the progress of this embryo Soviet at Brighton.

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

No Loan for Germany.

Thanks to the resistance of France and to the very opportune intervention of Lord Northcliffe, the preposterous suggestions that France should reduce her claims on Germany and that Germany should be financed by the persons she has injured have come to naught. Germany, as Lord Northcliffe shows, can presumably pay her debts. To show her good faith, she should surrender to her deeply injured creditors, among other things, the whole of the contents of her museums and art galleries. These would fetch a tidy sum in America, and Mr. J. P. Morgan, as a connoisseur, would doubtless be delighted to superintend the transaction. Or the pictures and statues could be removed to the devastated regions of France and Belgium, which would attract considerable numbers of tourists to those districts. There must, also, be very large stocks of alcoholic liquids in Germany which our thirsty cousins across the Atlantic would be happy to consume! The Germans were out to enslave their enemies. Those enemies have a perfect right to sentence them to a long term of penal servitude.

"His Majesty's Government" and France.

Who has drafted the discourteous and offensive Memorandum in reply to the French Memorandum on the work of The Hague Commissions? And for what object has it been published? We invite our readers attentively to read an extract from this curious document :—

His Majesty's Government have been anxious to return a prompt and helpful reply, but have found some difficulty in doing so, because the argument of the French memorandum appears to rest upon some confusion of thought, and also to show some unfamiliarity with the ground covered by the Genoa Conference.

That is Diplomatese for "The French Government cannot think logically and is grossly careless."

The Status of "Russia."

Apart from the offensive language of the Memorandum, the ideas in it fill us with the utmost misgiving. "Russia," it would seem, "is a Sovereign State, whatever opinion foreign Powers may hold of the character of her Government. To endeavour to assume the contrary is not merely a waste of time; it is a denial in the single case of Russia of those very principles to which Europe wishes Russia to return, principles deeply rooted in European civilisation, which govern the relations of all self-respecting and other respecting States."

The "confusion of thought" in this passage is very striking. What exactly does "Russia" to-day connote? From "His Majesty's Government's" nebulous notions one turns with relief to those of Mr. Irving T. Bush, the President of the New York Chamber of Commerce, as reported in the *Times* of last Monday :—

Mr. Irving T. Bush on "Russia."

I think there is a feeling here that America is keeping out of these conferences because of a lack of interest, and because of a tendency to avoid becoming entangled in European affairs. I do not think that is so. I think America recognises to-day that we are entangled in European affairs and cannot escape from them. I think the fundamental reason why we keep out of these conferences is because we are asked to sit round the conference table with Russia.

We believe that the Russian economic policy is based on dishonesty and on an absolutely unsound economic foundation. The result of these conferences with Russia is that you set the stage for them—you put them in the spot light, you give them an opportunity which they would otherwise not have, and you leave in the minds of the masses of the people of some other countries a doubt as to whether the Russian experiment has failed or not. If that doubt is left, it may lead to other countries passing through the same tragic experiment as that through which Russia has passed. It is, therefore, a vital need of the whole world to know whether the Russian experiment has succeeded or failed—and the matter is one which cannot be temporised with.

Bolshevists Ignore the Truce.

In last week's *Communist* there was published a letter from Comrade A. Losowsky, general secretary of the Red International of Labour Unions. He writes to inform the comrades that a conference of the R.I.L.U. will be held at Moscow on 25 October of this year, and the British section is invited to send delegates to this conference. In the paper *All Power*, "the official organ of the Red International of Trade Unions," issue for June, a special notice on this Moscow Conference states that the chief subject to be discussed "is the forming of a United Front for Action against the offensive of the International Capitalists." Trade unionists are asked to get the following resolution passed by their branches :—

This meeting of calls on the Executive Council to take steps to secure the election of delegates to attend the Second Congress of the R.I.L.U., to be held in Moscow on 25 October, 1922.

The nature of the campaign of this Moscow organisation is shown in the concluding paragraph of a leading article in *All Power*, entitled "The Coming Crash." It states that :—

If the Revolutionists now inside the unions will concentrate on this task (the use of power) in all the large industrial centres, the British Bureau will co-ordinate all their activities, and by these means shall we build up strong unions that very speedily will be engaged in the last struggle—the struggle for Power, and thus end the system which to-day holds the English Working Class in abject misery.

These remarks leave no doubt about the utter futility of the "truce" arranged by Mr. Lloyd George, but we do not anticipate that these facts will cause the Coalition Press to pay more attention to the truth. We shall still be regaled with fairy stories, because truth and the present Coalition cannot exist together.

No Truck with Bolshevism.

There is an interesting article in the *Nineteenth Century* for June, by Mr. George A. B. Dewar, on the subject of the late negotiations with the Bolshevists; and the basic difficulties presented by the characters and policies of the present rulers of Russia are summed up in the words :—

"I am one of those who do not want to go in with Lenin on any terms at all, or to have any sort of 'pact' with him whether it relates to money or whether it relates to peace, and who believe this question of deal or no deal with Bolshevism to be, incomparably, the most critical public question of to-day."

Barrow Communists.

Barrow appears to be the chief centre of disturbance at present. The *Communist* claims that in Barrow the revolutionaries have been able successfully to resist the police. The engineers and unemployed united and, with the aid of mass pickets, they have "not only closed down the town, but presented a power which is able to stand up to the police lawlessness." Extra police have been drafted in. "Conflicts have since occurred," remarks the *Communist*, "in which the magistrates have, of

course, handed out fines and sentences to the unemployed, presumably for impeding police batons by placing their heads in the way—but the alien forces have not succeeded in breaking up the formation or spirit of the Barrow boys. Up to date they hold the victory." Mr. Lloyd George will see that the "truce" is working as usual—like the other "truce" he arranged in Ireland.

Basis of the Engineers' Dispute.

The enormous injury to industry and to workers through the Engineering lock-out was absolutely inexcusable, and had no relation to the welfare of the members of the trade unions involved. It was entirely political in character as part of the unceasing movement towards Socialism, preceded by the destruction of industry under Capitalism. One of the "intellectuals" whose business in life is to forward such destruction, Mr. G. D. H. Cole, the Guildsman, wrote in the March *Labour Monthly*:—

> Every effort must be exerted to encroach on the capitalist management of industry. There is too great facility nowadays in holding that all progress towards trade union control in industry must be postponed to not merely after the revolution, but also after the subsequent period of stern, centralised proletarian dictatorship.

The *Labour Leader*, organ of the I.L.P., says:—

> Trade unions were invented to interfere with management, and can be used as an instrument of working-class progress only by a steady encroachment on the domain of management and ownership.

"The Jewish Guardian."

Less than three years ago the *Jewish Guardian* was started to combat Bolshevism among the Jews. Many British Jews are law-abiding citizens who prefer the Commandments of Moses to those of Trotsky and the *Jewish Guardian*, we gathered, was to be their organ. Unfortunately, at a very early date, the proprietors and staff of this excellently produced twopenny weekly, which contains twenty large pages of printed matter, appear to have discovered that the Bolshevist current in Jewry was much stronger than they had imagined. To-day the *Jewish Guardian* confines much of its attention to attacking persons like the Duke of Northumberland, warning the public against Jewish Bolshevism. On May 12 its editor addressed a letter to His Grace asking whether he would (1) "maintain the principle of equal rights for all British subjects, irrespective of their religious denomination?" (2) "Support, as occasion might arise, the removal of religious disabilities in countries where such disabilities are still in vogue?"; and (3) "avoid lending the weight of his authority to anti-Semitic propaganda?" That is to say, the Duke of Northumberland was to pledge himself not to expose the machinations of Jews, and he was to embark on a crusade against any State which dares to put Jews under supervision.

The Duke of Northumberland's Answer.

His Grace's answer was as follows:—

> Sir,—You ask me three questions as to what the attitude of the "Die-Hard" group would be, whether in the Government or in Opposition. I cannot speak for anybody but myself. My answers to your three questions are:—
>
> 1. The principle of equal rights for all British subjects should be maintained, so long as they remain loyally devoted to British interests and do not claim to be the subjects of any other State, or to belong to any other nationality.
>
> 2. I should certainly *not* support the removal of religious disabilities in other countries where such exist: other countries should be left to manage their own affairs.
>
> 3. The question is impossible to answer, unless you favour me with a definition of the word "Anti-Semitic." I shall certainly oppose certain tendencies, displayed by certain Jews, which I consider dangerous to the British Empire. If this is "Anti-Semitic propaganda," I shall continue to indulge in it.—I am, yours truly,
>
> NORTHUMBERLAND.
>
> P.S.—Might I suggest that, if the Jewish community in Great Britain desire the removal of religious disabilities where such exist in other countries, they should endeavour to influence their co-religionists in Russia to stop the persecution of Christians.

The Jewish "New York Call."

The Duke's arguments are unanswerable. The *Jewish Guardian* cannot seriously imagine that it is the Duke's duty to be silent when, for example, the Jewish *New York Call* of March 17, 1917, has published such a note as the following:—

> Kerensky considered his revolution a victory for the Jews. This opinion also prevailed in the East Side of New York, where rejoicing knew no bounds. We feel that this is a great triumph for the Jews' cause. The anti-Jewish element in Russia has alwaya been identified with the anti-revolutionary party, the Jews having always sat high in the councils of the revolutionists, and all of our race became inseparably linked with the opponents of the government in the official mind.

Clubs and Alien Employees.

Recently the *Evening Standard* accused our leading clubs of employing aliens. It acknowledged that the Service clubs were not doing so, but it suggested that this was exceptional. From inquiries we learn that, generally speaking, there is no foundation for the accusation. The late war has taught the committees of most clubs the unwisdom of having foreigners listening to their members' conversation and, perhaps, inspecting documents incautiously left in overcoats or unlocked valises. Under these circumstances we were greatly surprised to learn from a speech of Lieut.-Col. J. C. P. Perry, delivered on the 30th ult. at the annual general meeting of the Royal Automobile Club, where Dives is more at home than Lazarus, that when he joined the club "the *entire* staff in the restaurant were of alien origin, the only Englishman being the man at the desk."

The Royal Automobile Club's Action.

On this extraordinary state of things Colonel Perry very properly commented severely. The streets of London are thronged with our ex-soldiers seeking employment, and many of them are competent to hand round dishes. Colonel Perry, therefore, demanded that "the services of all alien employees should be dispensed with and their places filled by Britishers." But, so far from his resolution being carried unanimously, the meeting merely "approved and endorsed the policy of the committee in giving preference as regards any vacancies that *might* occur in the club to British applicants who *might be properly qualified* to fill the position so vacant." The italics are ours. We may be doing the committee and the members of the Royal Automobile Club who refused to support Colonel Perry an injustice, but, on the face of it, their conduct towards aliens resembles that of the High Commissioner of Palestine!

Kant and the Hohenzollerns.

In some respects the celebrated philosopher Kant was the Einstein of the 18th Century. How a predecessor (Friedrich-Wilhelm II.) of the ex-Kaiser treated the most eminent of German thinkers of his time may be gathered from the Rescript incorporated in our Unreported Conversation this week. This Rescript, dated October 1, 1794, was subsequently published by Kant himself, together with Kant's humble letter of apology. It is significant that a year after he was reproved the terrorised philosopher issued his treatise on "Perpetual Peace," the document which apparently inspired Dr. Woodrow Wilson.

REVOLUTIONARY PORTRAITS.—V.

A FEW TERRORISTS.

By NESTA H. WEBSTER.

It has been said in a previous article that most of the leading French revolutionaries were men distinguished for sensibility in their private lives. This characteristic would appear to have been not the exception but the rule. Robespierre, as a boy, had wept over a wounded pigeon, Marat was devoted to his two canaries. During the height of the Terror we find Le Bas playing Italian music and reciting Racine with Robespierre at the carpenter's house in the Rue St. Honoré. Chalier, who inaugurated the Terror at Lyons, where he declared publicly in the streets that all the rich merchants must be guillotined and their bodies flung into the Rhône, entertained a passion for the beauties of nature. "At the approach of evening the fanatic would go off to water the little garden of a friend . . . and there everything sent him into ecstasies, the meanest flower, a leaf, a blade of grass; he felt himself to be the possessor of a vast field, the inhabitant of a far-off desert." Amar, one of the most ferocious members of the Comité de Sûreté Générale, who had remarked on hearing of the drownings at Nantes: "All the better! We shall have finer salmon out of the Loire!" was filled with tender solicitude for some friends of his whom he went to visit in prison during the Terror. "Tell me," he cried, "are you deprived of the good things of life—of chocolate, of cakes and syrup?" And hearing of their destitution he burst into tears, exclaiming: "It is too dreadful!"

It should be noted, however, that these displays of sensibility were never produced in the revolutionaries by any members of the "people" who came to implore their mercy—poor women throwing themselves at the feet of the Conventionnels were ordered roughly away; their sympathy was reserved solely for their own friends and relations. I think it was Lombroso who said that sentimentalists are of all men the most cruel, and the history of the French Revolution certainly bears out this theory. Cruelty carried out in accordance with a theory is far more unrelenting than that which is the mere result of impulse. Dr. Arnold, in his admirable article in last week's "Patriot," divides revolutionaries into the two main types of "doctrinaires" and "bandits," and he goes on to observe that the tiger is latent in every human heart. Thus it lurks in the heart of the doctrinaire no less than in that of the bandit, only in the former case it may take some arousing. But once aroused it becomes absolutely remorseless. No more terrible glimpse of the way in which a naturally humane man may be transformed into a monster, by mere obedience to a doctrine, has ever been provided than in the letter of Robespierre's ally, Payan, to the revolutionary agent in the provinces, Roman Fonrosa, who had apparently shrunk from the atrocities he had been ordered to commit:

"There is no middle course; one must be wholly revolutionary or give up the idea of liberty. Half-measures are only palliatives which insensibly aggravate the ills of the Republic. You have a great purpose to fulfil; FORGET THAT NATURE MADE YOU A MAN AND A FEELING BEING (OUBLIE QUE LA NATURE TE FIT HOMME ET SENSIBLE)."*

The revolutionary must therefore cease to be a man if he is to carry out his mission successfully. Let those who believe in "peaceful revolution" take note.

But to turn to the other class of revolutionaries—the bandits. These are, of course, to be found in every revolution. A number of the men who rose to power in the first French Revolution were simply common criminals. Carra, editor of the *Annales Patriotiques*, had been guilty of robbing a widow and had spent two years in gaol for burglary, Sergent distinguished himself throughout the Revolution by appropriating jewellery, Maillard had been dismissed from his regiment for stealing, Panis, Westermann, Hébert, and Henriot had all been convicted of theft.

A further factor of great importance in studying all revolutionary types must, however, be taken into consideration—that of physical or mental *abnormality*. The condition may be only a passing one; many young men go through a period of revolutionary fever and afterwards settle down to be useful members of society. But the chronic revolutionary will be usually found to exhibit some peculiarity of mind or body. This was particularly so amongst the leaders of the French Revolution. Mirabeau and Danton, both perfectly sane, were men of unrestrained passions. Couthon was a paralytic. Robespierre was poisoned with bile. The "greyish pallor" of Saint Just, already referred to, was described by a contemporary as characterising most of the revolutionaries of his day. Liver no doubt played a large part in their ferocity. But the most marked symptom is the want of mental balance noticeable in the men of every faction which, particularly among the Girondins, takes the form of "exalted ideas"—the first symptom in "general paralysis of the insane"—amounting frequently to megalomania. Each man in turn declares himself to be the one pure and virtuous patriot, the one outstanding figure of the Revolution, on which he is convinced the eyes of all posterity will be fixed. We shall find this strange conceit running all through the revolutionary movement up to the present day.

In certain cases, however, this want of balance actually reaches insanity. Marat undoubtedly was mad. Carrier, who terrified his colleagues by his bellowings, "as of a famished wild beast," clearly became the victim of homicidal mania. Seated on his galley amidst the seraglio of women he had "requisitioned," he carried on his orgies, and amidst wine and song watched the struggles of his drowning victims. "I never laughed so much as at the faces those wretches made as they died!" In Alsace, Euloge Schneider, one of Weishaupt's Illuminati, perambulated his guillotine from one end of the province to the other, and when victims failed him he would roll on the floor, roaring and tearing out his hair. Vincent, in his lust for carnage, would devour raw meat like a tiger. "I am now a great man," wrote another of these monsters, "I can

* Capitals in original.

offer my friends every day after leaving the table a dish of men's heads."

It is the fashion nowadays to speak of the French Terror as "child's play" compared to the régime of the modern Bolshevists. Certainly the Terrorists of France had not the resources of Chinese torturers at their disposal. We find no record of such atrocities as "human gloves," but we read none the less of human skin breeches worn by the Conventionnels, of babies seized from their mothers' arms and cut in two, of women and children roasted alive in ovens. But to realise the full horror of that ghastly epoch one must follow the history of 1793 and 1794 in the provinces of France. It was there, not in Paris, that revolutionary frenzy reached its climax, and creatures one can only compare to mad dogs

J. B. CARRIER,
Né à Yolot, Dépt. du Cantal.

Quand il ordonne un crime, il est trop obéi ;
Par cent mille assassins son courroux est servi,
Et des fleuves français les eaux ensanglantées
Ne portaient que des morts aux mers épouvantées.
Volt. Henriade.

were loosed on the unfortunate population. As Prudhomme truly says, France had fallen into a kind of epilepsy. This phenomenon of revolutionary neurosis is one for medical research. An American doctor, who is also a profound psychologist, writing to me recently, observed: "To a physician, Carrier was evidently a sadist; the absence of hair from the face and effeminate type, etc., all tend to place him in the heterosexual class. . . . There is no question in my mind, from looking at his authentic picture, that Carrier was a psycho-sexual-abnorm type." And he goes on to suggest that some good psycho-pathologist should take up the question of the revolutionary type and its relation to certain vices. The thing has been done in France and Germany, but if any doctor in this country should care to investigate the subject of revolutionary "abnorms" he would certainly find it a fruitful field for research. Sadism should, of course, receive special attention. In a further article I shall show the part played by the author of this cult during the French Revolution.

THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND.

Mrs. Stuart Menzies, who has had the enterprise to form the "Truth About Ireland League," organised a meeting on June 9 at Caxton Hall, which was packed with a really enthusiastic audience; and the success of the meeting justifies the faith at the back of the League in the sympathy of the British public for the victims of Irish misgovernment, whenever the facts are made known.

Sir A. Sprot, M.P., presided; and the resolution of the evening was moved by Major Boyd Carpenter, M.P., in a stirring speech, which was seconded by Brig.-Gen. Prescott Decie, who had every soul with him in his stern denunciation of the Government's cowardly surrender to violence, desertion of Southern loyalists, and encouragement of attacks on Ulster. Lady Bathurst, in her double capacity of a known active worker for the Irish exiles here, and as associated with the *Morning Post*, the defender of the real Irish people —was most cordially applauded for a touching and effective speech. Mrs. Stuart Menzies was very successful in showing the need of such a League as she directs, in overcoming the apathy of the people on Irish affairs, which had been so widely produced by the doped Press of our country. The difficulties to be met in this mission of awakening, besides the financial one, were illustrated by the refusal of all the principal meeting halls to let space for the last proposed meeting of the League; and at last one hall agreed on condition of insuring for £10,000 against riot. Things are so, in this once free country, that it is considered dangerous to hold a public meeting to express sympathy with those who have suffered for their loyalty to the Crown. The wildest Bolshevism can, however, demand the use of the Albert Hall, and secure it.

A striking feature of the evening was the appearance of loyal refugees from Ireland on the platform; introduced to the audience by Mr. Hugh Menzies, who served with the auxiliary force in Ireland. Mr. Menzies gave, in a few words, a forcible narration of the terrible experiences of the victims of the I.R.A. and their associates the Red Communists; and in each case received the assurance that he had correctly given the facts.

The meeting was no place for anyone with a lingering belief that the Government of to-day is the only possible one short of a Socialist one. Every reference to the cowardice and blundering of the past was unanimously and noisily approved; and no expression of the speakers seemed too severe for the taste of the listeners. General Decie made it clear to all that last summer the revolution was really in hand, if the Government had not continually paralysed the military and the R.I.C.; let out prisoners of importance to join the enemy; and finally called the murderers into consultation on a peace treaty which could only be a surrender to anarchy. Since the "Treaty" was signed, evidence has been secured that General Decie was right, and it is now certain that arrangements had been made over wide areas to surrender all arms to the priests, who would have passed them over to the military authorities without the individual owners appearing.

Any subscriptions, however small, will be gratefully received by Mrs. Stuart Menzies, 52, Carlisle Mansions, Westminster.

UNREPORTED CONVERSATIONS.

VI.—PROFESSOR IMMANUEL KANT AND MAJOR-GENERAL VON BLÜCHER.

"Fräulein, at seventy, one must husband the eyes which God—if there be a God—has given one. Read me again the Royal Rescript! Between the Thing-in-itself and my Ego there is now a mist. I no longer recollect even the date when I received that Order."

"The Rescript, dear Master, is dated 1 October, 1794, and it reached you eleven days later."

"How did His Gracious Majesty address me?"

"As 'the worthy and very learned Our Professor and trusty and well-beloved subject, Kant.'"

"What vulgar and commonplace adjectives to apply to ME, who have discovered the Secret of the Universe! '*Our* Professor.' I might be His Gracious Majesty's dog! Speak louder; what did the Rescript say? I remember it was very offensive and menacing, and this lecture of mine must be kept within the letter and spirit of it."

"'*Our gracious greeting first. Our Sublimity has already for a considerable time observed with great dissatisfaction that you are misusing your Philosophical talents for the disfigurement and depreciation of many Head-and-Foundation Doctrines of the Holy Scripture and Christianity, and that you have especially done this in your book, 'Religion Within the Boundaries of Mere Reason.'*"

"His Gracious Majesty forgets that his late uncle was an atheist who employed Voltaire to pour filth on the Bible!"

"'*We expected better things of you,*' it goes on, '*for you cannot but be well aware that your conduct conflicts with your duties as a teacher of the young and with Our interests as Father of Our People. We, therefore, desire you at once to behave in the most scrupulous way possible, and We expect of you, under pain of incurring Our highest displeasure, that you will not in future be guilty of such offences, but rather, as duty bids you, apply your influence and talents for the furtherance of Our paternally patriotic designs, failing which you may expect the most unpleasant consequences.*' . . . Master, master, don't cry!"

"I—I've had no answer to my letter thanking His Gracious Majesty, and promising never, never again to offend him. . . . Is my gruel ready?"

"There's someone coming up the stairs, Master. . . . Entering without knocking! What manners!! . . . Pardon, pardon, Your Excellency!!! I did not perceive you were an Officer."

"Is that dwarf there the animal Kant? Fetch me some schnaps, woman! I and he have private matters to discuss. . . . Kant, I am General Von Blücher. I have been sent by His Gracious Majesty to give you your marching orders."

"May I—may I deign to ask Your Excellency who is to be my suc—suc—successor?"

"*Successor!* What is it talking about? You are to write—God in Heaven, where's my note-book? . . . Ah, yes! a *Philosophical Treatise on Perpetual Peace*. We are about to desert Austria and England, come to terms with France, and complete with Russia the Partition of Poland."

"But, Your Excellency, on what lines am I to write it?"

"On mine, or rather His Gracious Majesty's. Pick up that quill and jot down the heads of the —er—Treatise. . . . Are you ready? Forward!!! Leading idea: '*War should be abolished.*'"

"There are to be no more Wars! Mirabeau said that the trade of Prussia was War."

"So it is, but we shall need time to digest Poland, and your treatise is primarily to be for circulation abroad. We are afraid a Military Dictator may turn up in France. Forward!!! Special Idea No. I.: '*No independent State, whether large or small, ought to be brought under the power of another State by inheritance, exchange, purchase, or gift.*'"

"Or by conquest, Your Excellency?"

"Are you trying to be funny, Kant? Your grandfather was a Scotchman, I understand. Forward!!! No. II.: '*Standing armies ought in the course of time altogether to disappear.*'"

"The Prussian Army, in which my father served, to be disbanded!"

"Do you know the meaning of '*in the course of time*'? Forward!!! No. III.: '*No State ought to interfere by force with the Constitution and Government of another.*'"

"Your Excellency, won't that look like a reflection on His Gracious Majesty's late invasions of France and Poland?"

"Kant, the thalers wasted on you had been better spent on Hussars. That idea's to be inserted to make foreign fools believe Prussians are permitted freely to express their thoughts in public. Forward!!! No. IV.: '*There can be no Perpetual Peace until all States have Republican Constitutions.*'"

"Am I to suggest that Prussia should become a Republic?"

"Certainly; the Hohenzollerns will take care that it doesn't, or, if by any chance it became one, they would provide that the Republic should be a sham. Praise Republics up to the skies; you may help us cause Revolutions in Russia, Austria, Hanover, Saxony, Bavaria, Wurtemberg, and England. Forward!!! No. V.: '*A Universal Monarchy is contrary to Nature and the Will of God, and the World ought to be controlled by a Federation of Republics.*'"

"His late Majesty would have been shocked at that!"

"Haven't I already remarked that your treatise is not for Home Consumption? Forward!!! No. VI.: '*No European State ought to possess Colonies.*' We haven't any as yet. Beslaver all coloured peoples, and denounce the Slave Trade."

"Serfdom has not been abolished in Prussia!"

"What's that to do with it? Our serfs haven't black faces or woolly heads. Forward!!! No. VII.: '*No State at war with any other should employ assassins and poisoners, violate Capitulations, or instigate Rebellion in the hostile State.* . . . She's a hell of a time bringing that schnaps!"

"Shall I go for it, General?"

"No, no! I should expect you to bring me back by mistake a bottle of ink. Now, about when will you have this treatise ready?"

"Two months from to-day."

"*Months!* Aren't you the author of a work on Earthquakes? If it's not finished by Friday week you will have materials for a book on Manquakes. By the bye, should you breathe a word of what I've told you, we should treat you as a Hostile State, and demonstrate to you the difference between Theory and Practice. Come in! . . . The schnaps at last. Pay the woman, and find me a corkscrew!"

THE RUTENBERG CONCESSION.

By A STUDENT OF EASTERN POLITICS.

Sir Herbert Samuel's recent remarks—they can hardly be called a statement—to Members of the Houses of Parliament have verified the disquieting rumours which have been circulating in Palestine of late months. The meeting at which Sir Herbert Samuel made these remarks was of a private nature, for no meeting from which the Press is excluded can be considered as other than private. He is reported to have said "in the course of replies to questions, that a concession for electrical supply over the whole territory had been given to a Mr. Rutenberg. He defended that course on the ground that without a concession embracing the whole territory it would not be possible to get the capital necessary for development. That was the real ground of the monopoly." (*Daily Telegraph*, 26 May, 1922.) In other words, Mr. Rutenberg declined to vest his capital in a limited concession. Sir Herbert Samuel "was unable to say whether the material and machinery had been ordered in Germany." (*Morning Post*, 24 May, 1922.)

It is to be hoped that the extreme gravity and far-reaching consequences of this autocratic action by Sir Herbert Samuel will not be overlooked or minimised by people in this country. It will be necessary to ask Sir Herbert Samuel three plain questions, and to insist upon a definite answer to each. If these answers are ambiguous or in any way unsatisfactory (as we greatly fear may be the case), Sir Herbert Samuel's resignation should follow as a matter of course. The three questions are :—

1. Has the High Commissioner of Palestine the power to grant a monoply extending over "the whole territory" of Palestine, and to one who is neither a British nor a Palestinian citizen?

2. Assuming that the High Commissioner of Palestine has such concessions and monopolies in his gift, how is it that he has granted a monopoly of such comprehensive character without being able "to say whether the material and machinery had been ordered in Germany," or anywhere else?

3. Why has the monopoly been pushed through with such secrecy that Parliament and the public only hear of it as an accomplished fact (though the Zionist Organisation appears to be cognisant of the whole transaction), and that no British firm at home or overseas has had the chance to tender for it, while tenders for unimportant supplies are constantly invited through the English Press?

We know nothing personally about Mr. Rutenberg, but if a member of the Kerensky régime has survived *as an established capitalist* in 1922 we have at least the right to ask if he has had or has any relations with the Bolshevist régime. This concession—which, by the way, Sir Herbert Samuel rightly terms a "monopoly"—involves the establishment of immense works at the great water-supply regions of Palestine, Jaffa, Galilee, and Jordania. It will be found to involve the introduction into Palestine of some hundreds, possibly thousands, of foreign workmen (with, of course, their families), who will in all probability be foreign Jews like Mr. Rutenberg. The adequate accommodation of these workmen will necessitate the acquisition of large tracts of land around each supply-station for the erection of houses. It means without a shade of doubt that the whole of the electrifying of Palestine—a coal-less country, which is exceedingly difficult to keep in fuel of any sort—will be in the hands, not of the people nor of the Government of the country, but of a foreign syndicate which will be able to dominate the country by means of the electrical supplies upon which it must increasingly depend. In other words, the man or syndicate which holds the water supplies of Palestine has her by the throat.

Sir Herbert Samuel has done well in many ways in Palestine. He has filled an exceedingly difficult post with considerable tact and dignity; he is not a strong man, but he has recognised an able subordinate when he has seen him, which is one secret of successful government. This concession, implying as it does the control of the water, light, internal working, and future railways of Palestine, should never have been in the bestowal of any one man, be he the High Commissioner or not. It should not be passed, even at this eleventh hour, by Parliament except after the most searching analysis, nor should Sir Herbert Samuel be permitted to retain his post unless he can satisfy Parliament and public opinion at home upon the points indicated above. In granting a big public monoply to a foreign Jew in this private manner, Sir Herbert Samuel has not served well either the country which sent him out as its representative or the country of which he is the first British High Commissioner.

THE 4th DUKE OF BEDFORD'S PROPHECY.

On 15 November, 1753, the Fourth Duke of Bedford, speaking in favour of the Repeal of the Jews Naturalisation Bill, made the following remarkable prophecy :—

"Their (the Jews') power will increase with their property, and as their power increases their privileges will increase. Even at this time they are indulged with the privilege of having public synagogues, though expressly contrary to law; and after a great number of them have been naturalised by being born here, or by the American Act, we could hardly refuse establishing this privilege by a new Toleration Act in their favour. The next boon they would probably obtain would be a general naturalisation of all their brethren, and then I may venture to prophesy that the Jews would be the highest bidders for every landed estate brought to market in this island, by which means they might at last get possession of all the lay fees in the kingdom. As dominion always will follow property, could we in this case expect they would submit to continue under the disability now proposed to be laid upon them with regard to estates belonging to the Church? No, my Lords, they would not only repeal this law, but every law for establishing Christianity, and establish Judaism in its stead. They might then call this island their own land. . . . This I know, my Lords, may be deemed chimerical at first view; but it will not appear quite so chimerical if we consider that the first body of Saxons called over to this island did not amount to above 2,000 or 3,000 men, and yet in less than 150 years that nation, though not so well united among themselves as the Jews are, made themselves master of the greatest and most fertile part of this island; nor let it be objected that the Jews are not a warlike people, as the Saxons were, for a change of circumstances, with a few proper regulations, may produce an entire change of manners; and though nothing of this kind should happen, if they have the sole or the greatest command of money, they may prevail with one-half of the natives to assist them in subduing the other, for we know the power of money in Politics as well as in War. Thus it must appear not to be altogether impossible to imagine that the Jews may by this scheme of naturalisation, which we now seem to be so fond of, make themselves at last the chief masters of this island, and if they should, no one can suppose they would submit to be governed by the Royal Family now upon our throne."

LETTERS OF A PATRIOT—XII.

" Soft-heartedness, in times like these,
Shows sof'ness in the upper story."

Sir,—In THE PATRIOT of March 2 there was an article on the Fascisti, describing how the Italian people had succeeded, by an armed volunteer organisation, in suppressing the violence of Socialists; and the conclusion of the article was that " the persistent impotence of a Government leads either to Soviets or Fascisti." The Fascisti are still a great force in Italy; and, in one way, a threat to proper ordered government, as a powerful irregular body, subject to changes in aims. With the present great looseness in the use of words, Socialism in England is usually understood as a less virulent type of policy than in Italy; but as it is dependent for its real driving force and ultimate control on the more violent elements of Guildsmen, Communists, and Syndicalists, it must be treated in its official camouflaged body of the Labour Party as the enemy of the country and Empire. The occasional mild utterances on things in general by moderates like Mr. J. H. Thomas and Mr. Clynes should not be allowed to obscure the fact that all their policy is a mere class policy; that their mildest aims are Socialist ones; and that their supporters would not permit of moderation in securing or exercising the ends in view. In fact, Socialism by its nature excludes moderation. The general soft-heartedness for anything dubbed " Labour " has certainly justified the American poet Lowell in predicting " sof'ness in the upper story " ; for our governors have been driven into all sorts of foolish concessions to a political class party.

Few people know anything of the activities of the *International Labour Office*, which is an excrescence on the body of the League of Nations, and in its character is no more justified in the general interests of the Empire and League than a Conservative Party Office would be. A well-known writer has described the Labour Office as " Revolutionary, Socialistic, Subversive, International; despising the middle classes; issuing a daily paper, and costing the country £400,000 per annum." The " Internationalism " of all our intellectuals and revolutionaries—which is supposed to show a higher stage of evolution than patriotism—is purely a class and a Socialist movement. The great hearts, whose aspirations are pre-occupied with mankind in general, are invariably class agitators; and when they talk of mankind they are thinking of one kind of man; and they call him " Labour," so as to show they are not wasting thought on the Bourgeoisie part of humanity.

But the great mass of the people of this country will never accept Socialism if it is offered openly; and the questions arise as to how it is that our Government spends public money in subsidising the Socialist Labour Party in all sorts of ways; and why our foreign policy should be dictated and our home freedom restricted by that Party. The answer seems to be—*Politics*; *Fear*; *and Soft-headedness*: the last mostly to the credit of the public, through the fault of the Press. The word " privilege " has in past ages been associated so much with upper and ruling classes that the people fail to recognise and fight it when it is exercised by a minority of dictators pretending to speak for Labour. Do those dictators and political Labourites ever show the slightest interest in any attempts to limit the trade-union tyranny over the masses of the working men? The answer is in the negative. The tyranny of the few officials is essential to the political *solidarity*.—Yours faithfully, A. P.

TRADE UNION NOTES.

Sir,—The article in your issue this week—8 June—by Mr. Trackman on the subject of " Trade Union Control of the Railways " will be read with much interest by those who are interested either directly or indirectly with the working of our railways or are themselves members of the N.U.R., A.S.L.E. & F., or the R.C.A., and I may add that THE PATRIOT numbers amongst its readers members of each of those important trade unions.

As one who has had something to do with the election of the Sectional Councils, etc., on the railways, I would like to emphasise again the absolute necessity of the individual members taking a live interest in the election of their representatives on these Councils and Departmental Committees. (Of course, the National and Central Wages Board mentioned in the scheme are already in operation.)

Mr. Arthur Watson, the general manager of the L. & N.W. Railway, in explaining the scheme to the staff generally, concludes with the following paragraph: " The maintenance of good relationship between the company and the staff is, in my opinion, of the highest importance, and I sincerely hope that the new machinery now to be established will be the means of preventing and removing difficulties and misunderstandings, and foster a spirit of co-operation in the interests of the whole undertaking, the well-being of which is the concern of all."

If the work entrusted to the representatives of the Councils, Committees, and Boards under the scheme is carried out in this spirit, then great things may accrue from their deliberations, to the advantage of those responsible for the administration of the railways, the staff generally, and the travelling public.

But if, as Mr. Trackman seems to fear, the great army of railwaymen, whether willing or unwilling, unionists or non-unionists, are to be compelled to accept the unions as the arbiters of their industrial destinies, and we are to be under the control of the advanced section of the trade union element, then there is going to be trouble, not so much between the railwaymen and the railway companies, but between the rank and file of the members of the trade unions concerned and the " advanced section of the trade union element." We know that the three railway unions are affiliated to the Labour Party, which is working for the nationalisation and socialisation of everything and everybody, yet it must be remembered that there are thousands of members of trade unions—and I speak with some authority—who are not of the Labour Party and do not believe in, or approve of, Nationalisation, Socialism, or Syndicalism. The unfortunate thing about it is that these members have up to recently been an unorganised section.

As Hon. Secretary of the Trade Unionists' Rights League, I have received during the last few weeks a large number of applications for membership in our League, particularly from railwaymen in Lancashire, Yorkshire, and Cheshire, who approve of our objects to secure better attendances at trade union branches of the rank and file of members, in order that decisions when taken shall be truly representative of the whole of the members, and not those of an extremist and Socialistic clique. We are also making satisfactory progress towards the establishment of a Secret Ballot of Trade Unionists in disputes which will affect the interests of the country and individual members of trade unions.

(Guard) W. E. LOVEDAY,
N.U.R., L. and N.W.Ry.

"LISTENING-IN."

In the *Paris Excelsior* of October 8, 1921, Mr. John T. O'Callaghan, interviewed as the "accredited envoy of the Irish Republic," is reported to have said:—

> "Ireland cannot allow her own internal unity to be broken. Ulster is an integral part of Ireland. Ulster would enjoy in the Irish Federation the largest measure of autonomy compatible with national sovereignty."

If "Envoy" O'Callaghan had said "autopsy" instead of "autonomy" he would, in view of the I.R.A. doings in the Six Counties to-day, have been nearer the mark of truth.

* * *

No more heartening words have been spoken in our midst for many a long day than those uttered by Mr. James M. Beck, Solicitor-General of the United States, at "The Pilgrims'" dinner at the Hotel Victoria on 7 June:—

> "If," he said, "you decide that, in order to restore the economic welfare of Europe, it is desirable to deal with Russia in Russia's present form, and if we do not agree with you, that does not necessarily mean that England is wrong. *But as long as Lenin and Trotsky dominate* the fate of that unhappy people, by the living God, America will have nothing to do with them!"

* * *

In a paragraph headed "Surrender and Honour," the *Evening Standard* of 5 June told briefly of the capture by a contingent of the "Irish Army" of a contingent of the "Army of Ireland," who surrendered their headquarters at Dromore West Workhouse, but were allowed to retain their arms and equipment and to proceed on their road to fresh deeds of valour elsewhere.

What a "game" it all is! But why any of these "bould and dashin' heroes," to use an Irish expression, should go within a mile of any place that has the word "Work" in it, I cannot for the life of me understand.

* * *

The attempt in a small section of the London Press to interest the public in the "goings and comings" of Mr. W. R. Hearst proved to be a very damp social squib.

The newspaper that made the futile effort to "boost" the "gamboge" journalist started off by calling him "Mr. Hearst of the Silken Voice," and ended their descriptive article with the following fulsome "fool-food":—

> "A happy man, I think, with simple and care-proof habits; otherwise that silken voice could not croon and coo like a large dove with a grove of olive trees in its urbane bill."

* * *

In the agenda of the Labour Party's Conference in Edinburgh at the end of this month are several resolutions calling for the withdrawal of Labour Privy Councillors from that Council or their expulsion from the party. There is bound to be acrimonious discussion over these resolutions, and it could be obviated if the Privy Council expelled from its membership those P.C.s who are also members of the "Council of Action."

* * *

It is not so long since we used to read of the "Russian Steam Roller." It broke down, but one result of the recent Genoa Conference was the announcement that it has now been thoroughly repaired and refitted, and it is now manned by a crew from Berlin. It will in future be known as the "Russo-German Juggernaut," and will be used on the roads that lead "Westward Ho!"

RADIO.

THE CONCHY IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

COLONEL HURST'S PROTEST.

Outspoken comments on the report of the Select Committee on conscientious objectors come from Col. G. B. Hurst, K.C., M.P., himself a member of the Committee.

The country (he writes, in a letter to the *Daily Dispatch*) will have learnt with surprise that the Committee appointed to inquire into the position of conscientious objectors in the Civil Service has reported in favour of their retention.

A minority, which included Colonel Nall, M.P., for Hulme, and myself arrived at a different conclusion, but there can be only one report, and the will of the majority prevails.

No one can quarrel with the good faith and public spirit of those who would allow these men to keep their posts in Government employ, but I imagine that no other State would have shown such tolerance, and I cannot believe that the report will satisfy most well-affected citizens.

The Exemptions.

Evidence was adduced which showed that at least 230 men who were on the permanent establishment of various Departments in 1914—largely in the Post Office—were exempted under the Military Service Act, 1916, though of military age.

They were given non-military work during the war, and on August 20, 1920, they were all restored "to full established privileges" by a Treasury letter, the origin and authorship of which are still unknown, subject only to the loss of pension rights to the extent of the war period.

Several members of the Select Committee considered that it was now too late to revise the decision then taken, although otherwise they might have voted with the minority on the merits.

"A Moral Disaster."

It seems a moral disaster that in these days, when it is so hard to get any job in civil life, the State should give these conscientious objectors a life tenure in their employment.

It is said that no Government has as yet exercised its legal rights under Section 30 of the Superannuation Act of 1834 to dismiss civil servants at pleasure; that they have a conventional right to remain in their posts so long as they are not guilty of offences justifying dismissal.

But if such action by the State is unprecedented, the failure of the C.O.'s to pass the supreme test of their generation was equally unprecedented.

The value of Civil Service billets has grown greatly since August, 1920; the ex-Service man is generally worse off. Surely the State is under a duty to discriminate.

If this is a sound principle of national conduct, the decision arrived at by the majority of the Select Committee is a social outrage.

IS THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND GOING RED ?

SOME REMARKABLE CASES.

Many members of the Church of England ceased church attendance during the war because of the indifferentism displayed by their clergy to natural affection for England. Now the war is over, they have not returned, because the scandal of Sunday political pulpiteering—unknown hitherto save in notoriously Socialistic places of worship such as Whitefields Tabernacle—has spread like a pestilence among clergy of the Church of England.

Although the injury to Christian England caused by crazy appeals to class hatred printed by the *Daily Herald*—a paper described as "our own organ" by that pair of homicidal maniacs, Lenin and Trotsky—cannot be overstated, its editor is allowed to preach Socialism inside several of London's most historic churches of England. Although Karl Marx was a disgustingly blasphemous Jew, a lecture on him was lately delivered inside a well-known parish church, and the exterior of the sacred building was plastered with announcement posters.

In view of the coming general election, the Labour Party is doing for the Church of England just what the present Prime Minister did for Nonconformity before the general elections of 1910. The crowd of Church of England clerics spouting for the League of Nations now must almost equal the number of Nonconformist pastors who were familiar with the finances of the secretary of the Budget League before the 1910 contests. Nothing is changed except that instead of being told to "vote for Lloyd George in the interests of the Kingdom of Heaven," worshippers are now warned that "Christianity's only chance consists in supporting the *Daily Herald* in its fight for the workers against the ruling classes."

Few movements have been so rapid as that by which Labour Party propaganda has supplanted Christianity in many of London's best-known English churches. Parishioners whose interest is religious rather than partisan, are leaving.

Their places are taken by casual political audiences attracted by the names of Labour Party speakers announced in the *Daily Herald*. When, from time to time, newspapers comment on dwindling support for the Church of England, they merely reflect that silent sense of desecration which has driven English churchmen and churchwomen out of their own church.

To these people, still strong with love of country, it is shame unspeakable to hear their national churches used as sounding boards for acrid anti-nationalism and abuse of England. The sort of politician by whom speeches are delivered may be gathered from the fact that the Socialist Conrad Noel, whose Sinn Fein and Red Flag insults to this country are a continual scandal, has actually been announced at churches such as St. George's, Bloomsbury, and St. Paul's, Covent Garden. Other speakers have been persons formerly employed by "E. D. Morel's" notorious Union of Democratic Control.

Proceedings in *Daily Herald* churches mostly begin with some hastily gabbled form of devotion, which the audience endures rather than participates in. Then comes the real business, a frantic babble of semi-Socialism washed down with texts, and when the speaker subsides, the closing devotional exercise is generally almost inaudible, owing to the noise of the crowd tramping out of the door. The political meeting is over.

The peculiarity of speeches by Labour clerics is their attempt to popularise Internationalism by befouling English honour. Such allegations are common as that England acted dishonourably in defending Belgium, that the men who fought in the war ought not to have enlisted, and that Germany was not defeated, but cheated into surrender by this country.

A specimen of this malevolent inaccuracy appears in a church magazine, which also contains an article by G. B. Shaw, and an attack on the Christian Counter-Communist Crusade.

The reply to those who maintain that President Wilson's basis for peace accepted by Germany was disregarded is not a denial of the fact, but a shrug of the shoulders and a remark that "the Huns deserved all they got," which is clearly an evasion, for whatever a nation may deserve, it is clearly un-Christian to inflict punishment from which they were specifically promised exemption.—"St. Martin's-in-the-Fields Review," May, 1922.

A tendency only too clearly marked appears in this paragraph. It is a regrettable fact, that in the continual attempt to drag in the authority of religion to support their party, the appreciation of the difference between truth and falsehood becomes more blunted among clerics than among ordinary secular Socialists.

The Rev. G. A. Studdert Kennedy . . . said that he appealed to the troops during the war, and encouraged them to fight on the ground that they were fighting for freedom and honour. He knew now it was nothing of the kind. There was no freedom and there was no end to war. We had lied as a nation and besmirched our honour. We had broken our promises and gone back on our word in half a score of cases. . . They were mad, he said, he himself was mad, they were all mad out there. They were given decorations for what they did when they were mad.—*Morning Post*, 12 November, 1921.

The practice of getting speakers who were in the Great War to express regret publicly for having acted patriotically, by making speeches such as the above, is one of the commonest forms of Labour propaganda. On days set apart for national celebration, counter anti-patriotic demonstrations are always arranged. It will be remembered that even on Armistice day attempts were made to break up the two minutes' silence by blackguardly *Daily Herald* processionists.

On this year's anniversary of the signing of peace, a series of anti-English counter demonstrations, euphemistically called "No More War" meetings, are being organised. It is announced that at each open-air platform the principal resolution, which is, of course, a vote of censure on this country for not having betrayed Belgium, is to be moved in each case by ex-Service men, who are now on the side of the Labour Party. It will hardly be credited that not only will a number of London churches be used for this national insult, but actually a sermon is to be preached in St. Paul's Cathedral by a certain dean, whose defeatist utterances drew such well-deserved rebuke from patriotic Londoners during the war.

R. H. G.

THE OUTLOOK IN IRELAND.

The Treaty.

How do the British Government propose to reconcile the new conditions that have arisen with the Treaty and their often-repeated statement that a Republic is an impossibility, and what guarantees are they likely to demand that the assurances that will be given them are valid and can be carried out? Any alterations that may be inserted in the Constitution, which was thought to be one which might nearly satisfy Republican demands, will stir up fierce opposition as a submission to British dictation. "Whatever the Constitution contains, it is certain that some national rights demanded by the Irish delegates have been refused with threats by British Ministers. England is the common enemy now as ever. That is enough to make unity on our side absolutely essential." Hence it is feared that the crisis is by no means ended. Many even among the ex-Unionists who were zealous supporters of the Treaty are beginning to realise that they have backed the wrong horse.

A Free Election.

The joint appeal issued by Messrs Collins and De Valera gives a fairly broad hint that the Independents would do well to withdraw. This does not apply to the Labour candidates, the secretary of the organisation having stated that Labour would, if the need arose, present a solid front to any external power for the defence of national freedom. The appeal contains a remarkable sentence: that the Pact was regarded as the best means "to secure the nation from the perils which threatened it from without." This can only refer to England, and it is difficult to understand how Mr. Collins, who must know the confidence placed in him by British Ministers, could make such a statement unless he realised that the line of conduct he intended to adopt was inconsistent with his word to England. It is absolute folly to suppose that he could imagine any danger whatever from England, provided the Treaty was observed, or that England desired to violate her obligations under it. The emphasis at present laid on English hostility can hardly point to anything else than a deliberate intention to disregard the Treaty if and when thought convenient in Ireland.

The Past and the Present.

It is now said the British Government had to use force, because "it had not the moral sanction which would have enabled it to be patient, to negotiate, to make concessions"; but the Pact is an indication that the era of strong government, which meant government by force, is at an end. "The Government of the future will have the patience, the humanity, the consideration, the generosity of a strength which has no reason to doubt itself." . . . A novel method, surely, of restoring order in a country where the revolver is in the hands of all except the loyalists, "even schoolboys and schoolgirls were going about with revolvers," and the rule of the gunmen is supreme. The situation has been described by an ardent Republican: "There was no liberty or fraternity when a brat came out with a revolver and said, 'You cannot have an opinion of your own.' The kind of Republic these people advocate stinks in the nostrils of all thinking and patriotic people."

Real Irish Government.

Looting and robbery of every kind are increasing daily, the rights of property are absolutely disregarded, and no one in possession of land, if he is a loyalist, can consider himself safe from molestation, if not of expulsion. A typical notice may be quoted signed by the O.C. Brigade of I.R.A.: "I am authorised to take over your house and all your property, and you are hereby given notice to hand over to me within one hour of receipt of this notice above lands and property." The reasons set out are that the campaign of murder in Belfast is financed by the British Government, and that the owner, being a supporter of the Union between England and Ireland, is in sympathy with the murder of innocent men, women and children in Belfast. The one common element in all cases is the hostility to Protestants and Loyalists. Many have of their own accord abandoned their homes, anticipating the expulsion they had only too good reason to regard as inevitable, and of these the Provisional Government said that they were leaving the country unnecessarily without any justification for the plea of compulsion. Yet it is hard to see how compulsion can be denied. Living in remote parts in an absolutely defenceless condition, with no authority to look to for protection, they are the prey of any disorderly armed gang which happens to desire their property.

A Very Free State of Affairs.

A Free State proclamation recently published in a western county shows that the authorities realise the position. After calling on the people to co-operate with the Army in stamping out lawlessness, it states, "that irresponsible persons are taking advantage of the disturbed times, and are using the name of the Army for selfish and personal ends, raiding Protestant houses, giving them notice to leave the country and demanding money and property." When it is considered that it is often impossible to distinguish the Republican forces from any band of armed ruffians, the position of the victims can be estimated, and renders ridiculous the idea that departure under such circumstances can be regarded as voluntary. The Provisional Government is unquestionably responsible. When it took up office the country was in a comparatively peaceful and orderly condition, now it is a veritable hell for all except the gunmen. Soon all the best elements will have fled, with the consequent loss of money, employment, and trade.

Who is to Pay?

In spite of the undertaking of the Provisional Government to assume liability in certain cases, the question as to how these victims are to be compensated for their losses and enabled to live in the meantime has assumed enormous importance. They have the right to look to the British Government and nation, whose policy has brought them to such a pass, for protection and compensation. Will they look in vain, or is it now to be said that the lives and property of loyal subjects are to be mere pawns in the game of party politics, and that the British Government is now abandoning what has always been regarded as an elementary

principle of every form of Government in leaving these people to their fate?

Who is to Blame?

In the case of other crimes, the *Free State*, in condemning the murder of a soldier in Dublin, says: "At present the agent-provocateur has fair field for his labours, and there is reason to believe that he has selected attacks on British soldiers as a sure method of embroiling us with England. Again, in the murder of ex-policemen he has scope, and it behoves everyone to do his utmost to expose him." The desire is, as is alleged, to give England an excuse for reoccupying the country, and the guilty are apparently to be looked for among the class most likely to welcome such a reoccupation. Crimes are being openly alleged against Orangemen in the South, and the innuendo is almost complete that a great part of the outrages are due to loyalist agency.

Land Ownership.

In addition to the expropriation of landowners, the whole land question is causing serious trouble. The situation has been described: "Rents are being withheld, farms and grazing lands are being seized, for the first time in history the payment of land-purchase annuities is in arrear. In Co. Clare organised cattle drives are defying Dail Eireann and the I.R.A." And the non-payment of rent has the sanction of the I.R.A. In proceedings to recover rent in a Western Court the local commandant said: "I have been directed to inform you that in future and until further notice no land rent is to be paid in this area." "That," said the Chairman, "ends the matter," and the case was dismissed. Though it has been subsequently stated that this order only related to the tenants on a single estate, the episode is a vivid illustration of the state of the country, when the local forces can support an illegal campaign and the local courts abrogate their jurisdiction at the bidding of an officer of the I.R.A. There is considerable irony in the position that a country which regarded British Government as a military persecution should be burdened with such a system of unrestrained militarism as is evidenced by this episode. Land grabbing in its worst form is everywhere prevalent, and even the Minister of Agriculture gives it some degree of sanction when he says: "The acquisition, division, and establishment of homesteads on the untenanted ranches is necessary. Due largely to the plantations of the past, these ranches consist of wide areas of the most fertile land in the country, hungered after by the owners of tiny and barren holdings adjoining and by other classes of deserving claimants." Such is the condition of the country after six months' "freedom."

England's Weakness.

The Republicans have always contended that the present was the time to press on their policy, as England is prevented from taking strong measures in Ireland owing to her own internal weaknesses. Yet if lawlessness and Bolshevism are allowed to remain rampant in Ireland, the conditions must react on England, which is not without its own revolutionary doctrines. Unrestrained anarchy must quickly spread to a country already in difficulties with discontent and unemployment, in which there are many ready to fan the flame of sedition. The only remedy for England is to take immediate measures to assert her authority, to come to the assistance of her friends in Ireland, and to check the rebellious elements before the contagion spreads to her own shores.

TRADE UNION SLAVERY.

Mr. David Gilmour writes in the *Empire Citizen* on "Political Freedom for Trade Unionists," and some of his statements deserve wide publicity, such as the following:—

It is quite safe to say that no subject which has come before the present House of Commons has aroused more alarm in the ranks of the Labour Party than the proposal to amend the Trade Union Act, 1913. Prior to that date trades unions in their operations were restricted to purely industrial questions, and had no power to spend any part of their funds in connection with politics. Under the Act of 1913 this was altered, and although the provisions of the Act are very complicated and open to different constructions, there is no doubt whatever that the intention of Parliament was to permit the trades unions to collect from their members a special levy for political purposes. The restrictions laid down seem clearly designed to prevent the spending of the ordinary trade union funds in political work.

Yet it is an undeniable fact that many of the trades unions of the country simply pay out of their ordinary funds the amount demanded for political purposes, and there has never been any attempt to institute a separate fund.

Miners' Federation.

Take the Miners' Federation of Great Britain—this is a body instituted purely for managing the general work of the trades unions affiliated to the Federation. The sections comprising the Federation claim absolute freedom to deal with the contributions of their members, apart from paying a small sum for the managing of the affairs of the central body. In many instances those independent unions affiliated to the Federation have never attempted to institute a special fund, but merely pay up from time to time the amount called for by the Miners' Federation.

No Proper Secret Ballot.

I happen to be one of the three men who were called upon to count the votes of the Federation in connection with the Political Fund. In this connection I might say that the system of voting seemed to be absolutely unsatisfactory. Three of us—David Watts Morgan (of South Wales), the late Mr. William House (of Durham), and myself—put through our hands 450,000 papers. From the appearance of the papers it was quite apparent that some hundreds of thousands had been marked underground, and there had not been any attempt to carry out anything in the nature of a secret ballot vote. The minority comprised about 180,000 members, those voting in favour numbering 270,000, and yet the levy was called up by the Federation from time to time for the whole membership, which in later years reached nearly one million. The object of the ballot vote was to legalise the payment of 1s. per year per member for political purposes, but I am informed on very good authority that without any attempt to carry out a second ballot vote, the executive committee of the Federation passed a resolution to double the political levies, and, of course, it may be taken for granted that a delegate meeting homologated this action.

As time goes on, with the extremist sections dictating the policy of the unions, the funds which the members contribute for the protection of their labour are being gradually diverted to the political side. It would be interesting to ascertain the amount of money paid by trade union members for industrial protection which has been so diverted. It is high time that an official investigation was made into the whole question of illegal payments from trades union funds. It has been argued that other political organisations are not called upon to produce any statement as to their income and expenditure. The answer to that is very plain—every single penny contributed into other political organisations is on absolutely voluntary lines, whereas in the trades unions compulsory levies are enforced—or, alternatively, payments made from the ordinary trade union contributions fund. Many hundreds of thousands of workmen who refuse to vote at elections for official Labour Party candidates are yet compelled to pay their quota for the expense of running candidates to whose policy they strongly object. Is that fair? It seems quite reasonable that effect should be given to the proposed amendment of the Act, whereby instead of making compulsory deductions from trade union funds any individual member who desires his money to be spent under the auspices of the Labour Party should be called upon to sign a declaration to that effect. That is the whole gist of the question which is now before Parliament, and there is no doubt whatever that millions of the working men who pay into the trades unions will be very glad indeed to secure that the money which they contribute for the defence of their labour shall not be diverted for revolutionary and anti-British political movements.

CORRESPONDENCE.

NOTE.—While inviting correspondence, the Editor takes no responsibility for the opinions expressed.

To the Editor.

A THIRD LETTER FROM AMERICA.

Wilsonism: The History of a Formula.

Sir,—In my last letter to you (of 22 May) I finished with the words: "Events are now rapidly pushing Lloyd George into the camp where he belongs." Three days later, on 25 May, as readers of The Patriot are now aware, he crossed the Red Rubicon, the House of Commons following like sheep led to the slaughter, and is now leading England to where he has led Ireland.

It will be asked: "What has this to do with America; and what has Wilsonism to do with England?" To this it may be answered that during the last week a concrete and most interesting exposure has occurred, showing the connection between Wilsonism and revolution, and not only generally, but in the specific case under review.

Wilsonism may be defined as the practice of transmuting ideas and formulas into political doctrines, and then letting them loose to be made use of by man or demon. First there is the idea, then the formula. It is not, however, necessary that the ideas and formulas should all be the first children of Dr. Woodrow Wilson's brain, or that they may not be conceived in the brains of others. It is really a school of radical political thought. Dr. Wilson himself was, as he confessed, a kind of "high-brow" radical.

The best example of Wilsonism one can give is to quote Dr. Wilson himself. In a speech before the U.S. Senate on 22 January, 1917, he said: "I am proposing, as it were, that the nations should . . . adopt the doctrine of President Monroe as the doctrine of the whole world—that no nation should seek to extend its polity over any other nation or people, but that every people should be free to determine its own polity, its own way of development . . . the little along with the great and powerful."

That was the idea. Then on 11 February, 1918, he declared: "'Self determination' is not a mere phrase. It is an imperative principle of action which statesmen will henceforth ignore at their peril." There we see the idea formulated. But it must be remembered that this formula as a political doctrine first saw the light on 26 December, 1917, at Brest Litovsk. In this case Russians and Germans in collusion followed the usual procedure. The Russians in their "Peace" Proposal No. 4 submitted the idea, and the Germans in their Reply No. 4 formulated the principle, "the constitutional right" (of minorities) "of peoples to self-determination, etc."

Since then the formula, "loaded with dynamite," has been running a demoniac course of destruction. Ireland is a witness to its potency.

It will also be remembered that after its appearance at Brest Litovsk, Lloyd George immediately adopted the principle and gave it currency in the world of political catchphrases. That he has attempted to do a similar thing again is, as we shall see, more than a coincidence. It is a confirmation. The *Manchester Guardian*, as its files will show, also fell down and worshipped the new doctrine, with the probable result as aforesaid on President Wilson, who always reads the *Guardian*.

All this is propaganda history, of which no one has yet written; and it would be a confusing subject to write on. For instance, one opens a book on Dr. Wilson and looks up the index for "self-determination." You turn the pages, find a date *before* the war, and—no mention of anything at all even resembling the doctrine, nor even a part of the word "determine" mentioned! I have seen a pamphlet published about 1918 by the Candle Press, Dublin, called "Self-determination, by President Woodrow Wilson." The formula never once occurred in it. In both these instances the true instance of its occurrence was not given.

This, however, is peculiar about Wilsonism. The man, in his American way, was admirable, and even transcendent. "His energy is electric and irresistible," was truly said of him. At his first election he was taunted: "You will wreck the organisation that nominates you." He did, as some think, past repair. He left all its political bosses politically—dead. It may be said that during the war the contribution of his thought and the interference of his ideas (and points) put to the extremest test the resistance of the belligerents against revolution, and that Germany, who made the most use of Wilsonism to subvert her enemies, lost the war through first succumbing to it herself, and that the victors have yet to survive it. But what is one to think of such an idea as "Only a peace between equals can last!" (Congress, 22/1/17)? The attempt to visualise such an idea even in a League of Nations is sufficiently distracting.

No doubt in the future he will take his place among the heavens, somewhere between Rousseau and Marx; but, unlike the latter, his influence will not presage an infernal destiny. I like to picture Woodrow Wilson as Don Quixote, getting astride his valiant war-horse Columbia, shouting his war cry, "A League of Nations!" while Sancho Panza (the Senate) trembled for him. See him bear down on the three windmills—Erzberger, Hindenburg, and the Kaiser! "The poor fool!" says some earth-bound creature. But the word "fool" was not contained in his measure. For where are these windmills now?

The danger of Wilsonism, however, lies in the use to which it is put. It is "electric and irresistible," and may most destroy those who misuse it. That is a proposition to be reckoned on. We will consider, then, the concrete example of the use of Wilsonism as a revolutionary aid, not, however, only by Russians or Germans, be they Jews or Gentiles, but by an Englishman. Yes, by an Englishman, in such a way that whatever effects it has on Europe will be felt in America. For all Wilsonism comes home to roost.

The example is the first Cannes resolution on 6 January. It reads: "The nations cannot claim the right to dictate to each other the principles according to which they must organise their frontiers, their régime of property, their economy, and their Government. *It is the right of every country to choose for itself the system which it prefers.*" Although this looks quite innocent, it will be recognised at once as a form of Wilsonism. It contains the Wilson idea. At Cannes there was the Supreme Council of the Allies, in which was Lloyd George. There were Germans in the anteroom and agents of the Soviets in the background. The resolution was supposed to be a bait to entice the wary Russians to dip in the fleshpots of "capitalism," but it was observed that, thanks to Lloyd George, they swallowed the bait before the trap was set, as though they knew exactly what it was, and lest they should be prevented.

At Genoa there was further developed the idea of the "sovereign rights of States," but still no formula. The nearest the Russians got to it was on 6 May, in "All authorities recognise the right of a sovereign nation to confiscate property within its territorial boundary." On 11 May, in their reply to the memorandum, a formula was not used, even when discussing Clause 7. The Germans, however, recognised the "sovereign rights" in question in signing the Rapallo Treaty behind the backs of the nations. In doing so they spoke out of their turn, upsetting considerably the little Welshman. "He knew about it!" they said. We will see what he did know by reading on.

On 22 May occurred a minor mystery, which can be vouched for and proved by the editor of The Patriot. His correspondent, writing in Washington on that date, posted a letter by the "Aquitania" mail of 23 May, which letter has duly appeared in The Patriot for all to see. It contained the following prognostication: ". . . the Russians nailed to the mast for all the world to see their principles of Communism. These principles imply certain 'rights' which are destined to be better read when formulated through the usual channels of Bolshevik dissemination." They are as follows:—

(1) The sovereign right of a State to do what it likes inside its own territory; and (3) The right of confiscation.

The minor mystery can be explained at once. The writer has closely followed the Genoa Conference and could see what was brewing. He had read sufficient Woodrow Wilson to know what shape the formula would probably take. As we can see, it was only *one word out*.

On 25 May Lloyd George made his now notorious (I speak from the Washington standpoint) defence of his Genoa stewardship. The U.S. Government has not given the British Premier the lie direct, nor even used the word mendacity. For all that it has expressed its mind unmistakably. It is hard to explain how the speech affected Americans, they are such downright people. A citizen said to me: "What is the House of Commons made of?" I told him, "You don't understand the House of Commons. Not one of the 211 members present believed a single word he said." "Then why did he get such a majority?" he yelled. "Because," I told him, "no one took it seriously." I left him pulling out his hair with both hands. If ever that citizen be made President he will declare war.

But what is pertinent to our case is to observe that the speech of Lloyd George was in the main a statement of the case of the Russian Communists, deploring not their revolution but the mess they had made of it. If it be said that it was intended to appeal to the Red proletariat of England and France, there would be no evidence to disprove the charges. Twice when asked his attitude to France the same note was given out: "I desire to work with the democracy (*sic*) of France." If it be said that Lloyd George was synchronising with Chicherin in a common endeavour and propaganda to subvert the French Government or nation there is no evidence, especially since the opening of Genoa, to disprove that charge. All this fits in with the major mystery, which is this: in referring in the House of Commons to the

Cannes Resolutions, Lloyd George stated as follows: "The position of the European Powers is very clearly stated in these resolutions. . . . The first resolution acknowledged *the sovereign right of a State to do what it likes with property in its own territory.*" This was a lie, for the first resolution was not worded in any such way. But as a formula it was pure Wilsonism.

It will be observed that on 22 May I stated that certain formulas "were destined to be better read when formulated through the usual channels of Bolshevik dissemination," and that they "were"—exactly as Lloyd George gave it out on 25 May. There is really no need to say any more, except to emphasise the deliberate twisting of the first resolution into a formula for use by Bolsheviks and agitators.

The second mystery can also be explained. There is more than presumptive proof that the "idea" in the Cannes Resolution and the "formula" used by Lloyd George in the British House of Commons were concocted at Cannes in collusion with Germans and Russian agents. If it be desired to exculpate the Welshman from complicity in the conspiracy, it must be explained by him how he came to be the first to use the formula. It also clearly indicates that the rest of the thirty nations were used as a screen under which to cover the Bolshevik advance. It also explains why France was black-jacked by English propagandists of the Garvin and Paish type.

According to Lloyd George, the Hague is to be a "continuation of Genoa." If one will study the plan (18 May) of the Hague meeting he will discover from a study of Clause I. in what sense it is likely to be so. It reads as follows:—

> Clause I.—Provides for the appointment of a commission by the Powers to examine again the divergencies (*sic*) existing between the Soviet Government and other Governments, and with a view to meeting a Russian commission having the same mandate.

Here we have "a joker slipped in," to use an Americanism, designed to serve the same purposes as the Cannes No. 1 Resolution. It will be interesting to watch what will be developed from this clause at The Hague cabal, unless, indeed, the intrigue be squashed beforehand. This is obviously not a matter to be debated or settled by "economic experts" which it is now pretended The Hague is to be. A student of propaganda, by following the deliberations of the "Conference," perhaps may guess the formula which, for "the purposes of Bolshevik dissemination," it is certain has already been concocted, as before at Cannes, to express the real intention of this Clause I.

The association of Lloyd George with a revolutionary formula is, as we saw in January, 1918, no new thing. It then coincided with certain obscurities of his behaviour. At that period he allowed Litvinoff to come to England, attend the Nottingham Labour Conference, and to foment and organise revolution at the most critical period of the war.

As a doctrine, the "right of a State to do what it likes in its own territory" gives the right to prepare for a war of aggression or any other devilry. It is, as I have said, pure doctrinaire absolutism—Kultur. It is also sheer nonsense, for a State, if it be sanely governed, does not determine its policy by rules of conduct or doctrines of cause and effect, but it pursues the continuity of its existence as most expediently may be done.

Wilsonism, however, is a political force the world over to-day, and in America it is supported by both Democrats and Republicans. There are now under way various organisations for its perpetuation as a school of political thought. As communistic propaganda has succeeded in making the British political forum an arena where nothing else but the issues raised by it engage the political energies of the nation, so in the future may American politics become nothing else but fuel for sacrificing its interests to the manes of Woodrow Wilson.—I am, etc.,

SCARAB.

PATRIOTISM.

Sir,—Is patriotism understood or taught in England in the same way as it is in France, Germany, Italy and some other countries?

To take France, where the ideal of patriotism is perhaps more carefully instilled from childhood and practised throughout life than in any European land.

Every French man and woman is taught at school that not only sacred duty but closest affection is owing to "*La France.*" The French *patrie* is the religion and love of the life of every one of its sons and daughters. The last thought of a French soldier who dies in fight is generally expressed by his last breath in the cry, "Vive la France!"

Is the same spirit seen in England? During the first months of the war, after watching the fearful sacrifices made by the French I occasionally crossed to England, and was greatly struck by the different atmosphere that prevailed.

We English entered upon the war because we considered it our duty. Later on, even in the darkest days, Englishmen never seemed to me to enlist or go into battle for pure love of England. At first they entered upon service as a glorious adventure andl because most of us love a fight. Lord Kitchener's appeal of "*Your King and Country Need You!*" was gallantly responded to, but it always appeared to be more from a sense of duty than from any heart-born love of England. Everybody was determined to "do his bit," and not to be laughed at by his best girl for staying at home.

The French *piou-piou* went over the top with the cry of "*Vive la France!*" and the idea that he was about to give his life for her as he would for his mother or his wife. The admirable Tommy thought more, I fancy, of the joy of killing a Hun or of the family at home, but seldom of England. It is not our fault if this is really the case, because, in the first place, we have not been educated to love England with a human love, and also because for centuries we have never actually felt that England was in any danger or any need of more than loyal service.

Nelson's famous signal was that England expected every man that day to do his duty, and this has always (or almost always) been a sufficient appeal to Englishmen, who have a high standard in their idea of duty, whether it be to an employer or to their country. But duty is not love or devotion to a supreme ideal. It may be answered that it comes to much the same thing if the result is the same, but morally there is a difference, and a considerable one.

There is probably much more patriotism in our Colonies and Dominions than there is at home. But I doubt if anywhere within the Empire there exists a patriotism resembling the pervading influence that reigns in France, and also in Germany, and Italy, and places like Poland.

The words *Patrie*, *Vaterland*, and *Patria* have another sense to these people than *Mother Country*, which is comparatively seldom heard with us.

The name of your paper should act as a banner for the rallying of true patriots, and the teaching of patriotism in its grander and more splendid meaning.

I may be wrong in degree, but in that case it would be interesting to hear the opinions of those who consider that British patriotism as it now exists is an adequate feature in our national life.—I am, Sir, yours,

A. HULME BEAMAN.

17, Rue de la Pepinière, Paris, 5 June, 1922.

PLAIN WORDS.

The following are extracts from the speech delivered at Caxton Hall on 9 June by Brig.-Gen. Prescott Decie. The country needs such words:—

I am told I am bitter, and, by God, I am bitter. (Cheers.) You have heard these awful stories. These things are going on in the United Kingdom, and we sit by like cowards and fools and look on. (Cheers.)

This is no fight for the Free State or the Republic, but an attack by the enemies of England on the British Empire. (Cheers.) When the truce was made, in spite of all the difficulties put on us by the cowardice of the British Government, we had the rebellion in Ireland beaten. I know now, what I did not know then, that they actually had the arms ready to hand in, and if we had gone on another week, fortnight, or month, and had harried them as we meant to, all the arms would have been quietly handed in and the whole thing would have been over. (Cheers.)

With whom did you make the truce? (Cries of "Murder!") De Valera, a foul foreigner, comes to the United Kingdom, sets up a Republic, and the British Government sets up the truce with him. I would have hanged him. (Loud cheers.) Michael Collins, a common murderer from County Cork—(cheers)—comes, and the great British Government makes a truce with him. (Laughter.) You know from that moment I resigned, and I utterly despise the British Government.

If you let Ulster go, you will go next. I have heard people say that the Irish Loyalists did not play up. The Loyalists in any country have only one organisation, and that is the Government, and when the Government suddenly slips from you, you have nothing whatever left.

You will be attacked over here. This country of yours is divided up into areas of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, and each area has its commandant; and the Sinn Feiners and the Bolsheviks have undoubtedly got arms. You are the Loyalists, and you are not allowed to carry arms. If anything occurs and the Sinn Feiners, backed up by Bolsheviks, turn out with arms, what are you going to do? You have not one single, solitary dog's chance.

That is what happened to the Loyalists in Ireland, and it is what will happen if you have this damned Government here much longer.

Lloyd George and his Cabinet quack about the danger of Bolshevism and Labour. There is no danger if they will tell the English people what to do. They are as loyal to the backbone as they were in 1914. If we only had a leader you would be with him to a man. (Loud cheers.)

THE PATRIOT

No. 19.—Vol. II. 15 JUNE, 1922. PRICE SIXPENCE.
REGISTERED AT THE G.P.O. AS A NEWSPAPER.

AN APPEAL TO THE NATIONAL HONOUR.

THE RESTORATION OF CLEAN GOVERNMENT.

SUPPORT THE DIE-HARDS.

Our appeal for support in the restoration of honesty in politics is addressed to all those who, irrespective of the party with which they may be associated, regard with apprehension the present condition of the national affairs. All political parties alike, together with that large proportion of the electorate which keep themselves aloof from party, are concerned in the probity of the Government and the stability of the State. Time was when the word of a British Government was as good as their bond: to-day, their word no man believes in, and they cancel their bond at will.

A Government Afraid.

It will not be denied that the first duty of a Government is to maintain intact the Dominions of his Majesty the King; to protect the persons and property of the King's subjects; and indifferently to administer justice; and in all circumstances to abide by a pledge once given.

Upon the observance of these elementary principles of public morality depends the honour of the country, in which is involved the honour of every citizen. The Coalition Government have put the honour of the country in pawn. Who, while there is yet time, will redeem it?

At the moment when the Prime Minister and his colleagues fell to treating with murderers, their feet were set upon a descent, slippery with the blood of faithful servants of the King, upon which there is no turning back. In that moment they forfeited their title to their high office, and earned the contempt of every honest man and woman.

Favouring the King's Enemies.

What is the meaning of the sinister statement reiterated by responsible persons, that at the time the infamous truce was made with the Irish rebels the forces of the Crown were at the point of finally suppressing the insurrection?

The abject surrender to the organised assassination and the Bolshevist conspiracy in Ireland coincided with the toleration of sedition in India and the abandonment of Egypt, the central strategic station of the Empire, under the threats of inciters to mob violence. These betrayals of trust coincided also with the furtive negotiations of the Prime Minister with the abominable tyranny of the Russian Soviet, the implacable enemies of British rule in every part of the world. At the same time, it has been the persistent policy of the Government, ever since the signature of the Treaty of Versailles, while professing friendship with France, to work against France in the interests of Germany.

The Dead Betrayed.

For what was the war fought and won? A part—the greatest part—of that purpose was to hold what we possessed. Is the country to stand idly by while its inheritance, so hardily gained, retained at a cost so bitter, is bartered away to the King's enemies? For that is what is happening. The excuse proffered by our cowardly rulers is that they must buy peace at any price. The country pays the price in blood and treasure; but there is no peace, nor will be. *With so much dishonour, you might have bought a little peace,* said Lord Hugh Cecil.

It cannot be. The men disbanded from Navy, Army, and Air Force, to make room for the Socialist Bureaucracy and the conscientious objector, will be wanted again, and that soon. The day is swiftly coming when the country will be forced to choose between the dismemberment of the Empire and fighting for its existence. Mr. Lloyd George is running this country straight into war again.

A Degrading Traffic.

People are reluctant to believe evil of their rulers. Their rulers take advantage of that honest faith to impose upon the people. If righteousness exalteth a nation, how shall unrighteousness not debase it? Political corruption is one cause of the decay. It began with the Marconi scandal which went unpunished. It continued in a system of mendacity and illicit influence unparalleled since the Reform Act. The sale of honours has become so notorious that names and prices are openly quoted, and the profits amount to a handsome fortune. The existence of that secret hoard, available for every device of the unscrupulous politician, is a public danger. It is being used, and will be used, to continue the reign of the Coalition, which endows the Prime Minister and his Cabinet Secretariat with an autocracy fatal, and designedly fatal, to representative Government. There is nothing wrong in collecting a party fund; but to get money by selling honours and other benefits is infamous.

The Men Who Stand Fast.

There is in Parliament a body of men called the Die-Hards, which alone protests against the betrayal to the King's enemies of British rights, which alone stands for honesty in politics and the exposure of corruption. First of all, the Die-Hards demand clean administration.

That demand must appeal to every decent citizen; for not Liberal, nor Labour, nor Conservative can hope for peace, welfare, and prosperity under the rule of organised political corruption.

All over the country, indeed, the constituencies are asking the Die-Hards to organise meetings and to send speakers. These things cost money. It is for that reason we are asking for money. For although the Die-Hards are the core of the Conservative Party, and will be the Conservative Party of the future, they must have money with which to accomplish their task.

Therefore we appeal to all those who desire the restoration of political honesty to contribute to that cause. There are no honours to be purchased; there is nothing to buy, except honour; nothing to gain, except the chance of saving the country and the Empire ere it be too late.

All money contributions should be sent to the Editor, *Morning Post*, 346, Strand, W.C.2. Cheques to be crossed "Die-Hard Fund."

THE PATRIOT.

Copies of THE PATRIOT can be obtained either through the usual agents or direct from the publishers:

THE BOSWELL PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,
2, WHITEFRIARS STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

Single Copies, 6d.; or 7d. post free.

Terms of Subscription:—
3 months, 7/6; 6 months, 15/-; One year, 30/-.

The Publishers can supply Vol. I, bound in cloth, 13 issues, complete with Supplements, at 15/-

Published by THE BOSWELL PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO., LTD., 2, Whitefriars Street, London, E.C.4.
Printed by ST. CLEMENTS PRESS, LTD., Portugal Street, Kingsway, W.C.2.